

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7-20 were rejected and claims 2-6 were objected to. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 11-13 have been amended. Claims 2 and 17-20 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 7-10 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Conoval (U.S. 6,400,903).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of objected to claim 2. Therefore, claim 1 and all the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1 and 7-10.

II. Rejection of Claims 11-15 and 17-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 11-15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rodriguez (U.S. 6,889,191). The applicants note that claims 17-20 have been cancelled herein.

CLAIM 11

Claim 11 is independent and is retyped as follows:

An image capture system comprising:
a first function that is accessible by a user;
a proxy-based remote control mechanism for receiving commands from a foreign remote control, for associating at least one received command with the first function of the image capture system, and for

storing the association between the received command and the first function in an association table during a training mode;

wherein the proxy-based remote control mechanism during operation receives commands from the foreign remote control, decodes the received commands by employing the association table, and allows the foreign remote control to access the function of the image capture system corresponding to the decoded command; and

wherein the training mode comprises: instructing a user to press a button on the foreign remote control for a predetermined function of the image capture system; the foreign remote control transmitting a command associated with the button; the image capture system receiving the command; and the image capture system associating the received command with the predetermined function of the image capture system.

The bold type portion of claim 11 is representative of claim 2, which has been incorporated into claim 11. As set forth above, claim 2 was objected to. By incorporating claim 2 into claim 11, the applicants contend that claim 11 and all claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Based on the foregoing, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections of claim 11-16.

III. **Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez in view of Conoval.

Claim 16 is dependent on claim 11 and is deemed allowable by way of its dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

February 8, 2006

By: *Robert Nelson*
Robert Nelson
Registration No. 37,898
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 298-9888